DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 468 SO 012 401

AUTHOR Ulbrich, Patricia: Huber, Joan
TITLE The Effect of Observing Parental Violence on Gender-Role Attitudes.
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 27p.: Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Boston, MA, August 27-31, 1979). Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression: *Childhood Attitudes: *Family Life: Fathers: *Females: Hostility: Housewives: *Males: Mothers: Parent Attitudes: Parent Child Relationship: *Parent Influence: Parent Role: Rape: Socialization: Social Science Research: Spouses: *Violence: Working Women

ABSTRACT

Results of a study to determine the effect of observing parental violence on attitudes about women's roles and the use of violence against women are reported. A national random sample of 1,092 women and 910 men were interviewed by telephone. Participants responded to questions such as: Did your father ever hit your mother? Did your mother ever hit your father? Responses were rated on a scale from never to often. Attitudes toward women's maternal and employment roles and about violence toward women were also measured. Seventeen percent of the sample reported having witnessed parental hitting, with an indication that although women engage in hitting, they are more often the victims of marital violence. The type of hitting reported varies by sex. More than half the women saw the father hit the mother: both sexes saw the mother hit the father less often. Parental hitting unexpectedly failed to significantly affect attitudes about women's roles. It did affect attitudes about blaming women for being raped, but the effect varied by sex. Income level and education also affected respondents' attitudes. In summary, men are more likely and women are less likely to approve of violence against women if they observed their fathers hitting their mothers. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183468

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Ulbrich
Joan Huber

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE EFFECT OF OBSERVING PARENTAL VIOLENCE ON GENDER-ROLE ATTITUDES*

Patricia Ulbrich and Joan Huber

SO 013 401

*We are grateful to the National Science Foundation (SOC 76-82025) for supporting this research. Sampling, pretesting, and interviewing were conducted in 1978 by the Survey Research Laboratory of the University of Illinois. Lee Hamilton and Glenna Spitze usefully commented on earlier drafts.

Patricia Ulbrich is a graduate student in the Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 61801.
Joan Huber is Professor and Head of the Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 61801.

ABSTRACT

Using data from a national probability sample of 910 men and 1,002 women, this research describes the distribution of reported parental hitting and tests whether it affects attitudes about women's roles and the use of violence against women. Parental hitting, reported by 17% of the sample, failed to affect attitudes about women's roles but it affected attitudes concerning the use of violence against women. Men are more likely and women are less-likely to approve of violence against women if they observed their fathers hitting their mothers.

THE EFFECT OF OBSERVING PARENTAL VIOLENCE ON GENDER-ROLE ATTITUDES

The most recent women's movement, by calling attention to the social and cultural basis for women's status, has stimulated research on the role of violence, especially spouse violence, as a factor in women's subordination. Based on the assumption that the use of violence is learned, the growing literature on family violence (Goode, 1974; Wolfgang, 1976; Straus, 1978) and on violence against women (Martin, 1976; Dobash and Dobash, 1978; Gates, 1978; Pagelow, 1978a, 1978b) implies that spouse violence results from gender role stereotyping, gender inequality, and family power distribution. Empirically, however, little is known of the extent, correlates, or consequences of U. S. husband-wife violence because research has involved nonrandomly selected persons involved with the divorce court (Levinger, 1966), health clinics (Hilberman and Munson, 1978; Rounsaville, 1978), the police (Bard, 1974; Gelles, 1974), social work agencies (Gelles, 1974; Gayford, 1975; Roy, 1977) or neighbors of such persons (Gelles, 1974).[1]

Our research, based on a national probability sample, has two purposes. First, we describe background variables associated with respondents' reports of the incidence of one form of parental violence--whether a respondent's father ever hit the mother and, if so, if the event occurred often, sometimes, or rarely, and vice-versa for respondent's mother.

Second, we examine the effect of reported parental hitting on respondents' attitudes about women's roles and violence toward women. Based on propositions from social learning theory and on gender-role theory and research, we expect that respondents who report having observed parental hitting will tend to hold traditional attitudes about women's roles and will tend to approve using violence against women.

The Legacy of Subordination

Historically, women's status has varied with their participation in production and the degree of their control over distribution of goods outside the family (Friedi, 1975), hence their status was probably lowest in agricultural and herding societies. Because contemporary industrial societies descended form the great agricultural empires of Western Europe, and because these empires and kingdoms were influenced by the moral norms of an ancient herding society (Lenski and Lenski, 1973), many current laws and customs still reflect the norms that prevailed in these earlier societies.

Both within and outside the family, assault and rape have been used to subordinate women (Russell, 1976;ix). Historically, wife-beating was an approved means of controlling women's behavior (Dobash and Dobash, 1978). Although wife-beating is no longer legal (Pleck, 1979), it often finds tacit support in law (Martin, 1976; Straus, 1976) and some support in public opinion; the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence reported that about one-fifth of Americans approve of a husband's slapping his wife's face (Baker and Ball, 1969;343). Straus (1979:10) reports that men who believe that husbands should dominate a marriage are more likely to report assaulting their wives than are husbands with different values. Similarly, rape laws reflect traditional notions of women's chastity, implied consent, and woman as man's property, although increasingly today rape is defined as a criminal sexual assault (Wilson and Clarenbach, 1979:16).

Thus using violence against women to control their behavior is part of traditional culture. Social learning theory will help to explain how this culture is transmitted to children.

Learning Violence

Unlike theories which emphasize behavioral reinforcements, Bandura's (1973, 1977) social learning theory stresses the influence of a model: people learn how to behave by observing how other people behave. The prestige of the model and the functional value of the behavior influence which behavior commands attention. Hence behavior is often adopted in much the same form as it appeared to the observer.

The model affects the observer in two ways: new, integrated behavior patterns are acquired and existing patterns are strengthened or weakened (Bandura, 1973:68). Since early family experience provides children with broad and subtle models of appropriate gender behavior, children who observe parental violence should learn how force can be used against women. Empirically, interpersonal violence observed in childhood increases approval of such violence as an adult, for men more than for women (Owens and Straus, 1975:206); men who beat their wives tend to report having seen their fathers hitting their mothers (Gelles, 1974:173; Roy, 1977; 31; Straus, 1979:12).

Yet people do not perform all that they have learned. Human capacity to use symbols enables them to foresee consequences of different actions. Disjunctures between learning and performance tend to occur when the new behavior has limited functional value or carries high risk of punishment (Bandura, 1973:65). Since women involved in spouse violence tend to get the worst of it (Gelles, 1974; Straus, 1978), a daughter's observation of parental violence should inhibit aggressive behavior. Hence gender socialization in a traditional family may lead men to expect to dominate women while it leads women to accept subordination (Pagelow, 1978a).

Our two main hypotheses, derived from social learning theory in the cultural context of traditional values, are that respondents who report having witnessed parental hitting will be more likely than others to hold traditional attitudes about women's roles and that such respondents will also be more likely to approve of violent behavior against women. A subsidiary hypothesis, based on recent gender-role theory and research, holds that higher income and education and younger age will be associated with less traditional gender-role attitudes. We formed no hypotheses about religion because all three dominant U. S. religions hold values based on those of an ancient herding society.

METHODS

Sample

This study, part of an inquiry into the social bases of gender-role ideologies, uses a national stratified cluster probability sample of 1,092 women and 910 men interviewed by telephone late in 1978. We used the Waksberg (1978) method of random digit dialing, a simplification of Sudman (1975), which requires random selection of directory numbers, changing the last two digits to ensure including unlisted numbers. If the household head was married, the spouse was also interviewed, a procedure well suited to comparing men's and women's attitudes since, in effect, it holds other factors constant.

Measurement of Variables

Independent variables. Income, defined as total family income, was coded 1=less than $5,000 in $5,000 increments to 7=more than $30,000. Respondents who didn't know or refused to answer were asked if total family income was more than $11,000; responses were coded 2=less and 4=more.

Education is the number of years of formal schooling completed. Age is respondent's age in years. Race is coded 1=white, 0=nonwhite. Religion is coded in dummy variables for Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, other, or no religion (reference category). Marital status is coded in

dummy variables for married, separated, divorced, widowed, and single (reference category).

Parental hitting is coded in dummy variables based on responses to these questions: (1) Did your father ever hit your mother? [If yes] Would you say this happened often, sometimes, or rarely? (2) Did your mother ever hit your father? [If yes] Would you say this happened often, sometimes, or rarely? Responses were coded 0=never; 1=rarely; 2=sometimes; 3=often. For analysis, we needed to differentiate respondents who observed parental hitting from those who did not, as well as to differentiate who hit whom. We therefore created dummy variables to represent the absence of hitting and source of hitting when it occurred. The dummy variables are NCHIT, coded 1-no hitting reported, o=hitting reported; PAHIT, coded 1=father hit mother rarely, sometimes or often but mother did not hit back or hit back less often and 0=all other cases, MAHIT was coded 1=mother and father hit equally often; 0=all other cases. BOTHHIT was coded 1=mother and father hit equally often; 0=all other cases.

The five dependent variables are defined and coded as follows. WOMROLE ia an additive index of two Likert-type questions about women's maternal and employment roles: (1) A woman who works can be just as good a mother as one who does not. (2) By nature, women are happiest when they are making a home and caring for children.[2] Responses were coded 1=strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3=don't know; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree. [3] Responses on the first item were reversed to give the index a value range from 2 (nontraditional) to 10 (traditional attitudes).

Attitudes about violence toward women are measured with four variables. RAPE is a Likert-type question: Do you agree or disagree that any woman who is raped is at least partially to blame? Responses were coded 1=strongly

disagree; 2=disagree; 3=don't know; 4=agree; 5=strongly agree.

Three dichotomous variables concern conditions under which a husband may hit his wife: Some people think it is all right for a husband to hit his wife under certain conditons. Do you think it would be allright for a husband to hit his wife (1) if she is always nagging and complaining? (2) If she struck the husband first: (3) If the wife is seeing other men. Responses to NAGGING, HITFIRST, and OTHERMEN are coded 0=no, 1=yes.[4]

We used regression analysis to estimate the dependent variables and, if suitable, probit analysis, a maximum likelihood technique suited to estimating dichotomous dependent variables. Separate equations were estimated for women and men, yielding 10 analyses.

The relation of background variables to reported parental hitting appear in percents in Table 1. Unstandardized and standardized coefficients for WOMROLE and RAPE by sex appear in Tables 2 and 3. Unstandardized probit coefficients for NAGGING, HITFIRST, and OTHERMEN appear in Table 4. Subsequent interpretations are based on unstandardized coefficients.

Limitations

This study of spouse violence is limited in several ways. First, we asked respondents only about their parents' behavior rather than their own in order to reduce response effects. Bradburn and Sudman (1979:x, 169) report that response effects are greater for threatening behavioral questions than for nonthreatening ones, and that the effects are reduced when responsents are asked about their friends' behavior rather than their own.

Second, our measure of parental violence introduces a source of response error. In order to report parental hitting, the respondent must have seen one or both parents hitting the other. This measure may produce underreporting if, as Straus (1974-15) suggests, parents usually try to have their fights when the children are not around. On the other hand, Bulcroft and Straus (1975:11) found a high level of agreement between the child's and parents'

reports of spouse violence. It seems likely that respondents will have observed violence if the behavior is typical for one or both parents. Thus, the question of reliability is most relevant for those cases in which violence occurred infrequently or when the child was young. In either case, the response effect should be small.

A third limitation is the lack of background data for respondent's parents, owing to the need to restrict the interview to about forty minutes. We therefore cannot relate parental status to respondent's attitudes nor can we relate reported parental hitting to the parents' socioeconomic status. Whether spouse abuse occurs oftener at lower SES levels is unclear. Baker and Ball (1969) report that approval of interpersonal violence occurs oftener among persons with lower levels of education but their study did not deal with marital violence.

Finally, we did not ask questions about the circumstances in which parental hitting occurred. We do not know if women engage in hitting as a reaction to being hit or to the threat of physical assault, or if they initiate the behavior. This distinction may limit the interences we can make about the importance of the mother's behavior for the respondent's attitudes about violence against women.

FINDINGS

Reported Parental Hitting

Seventeen percent (N=342) of the total sample (N=2,002) reported having witnessed parental hitting. Nine percent of the respondents reported that the father hit the mother while she hit back less often or not at all. Six percent reported that their parents hit each other equally often. Three percent reported that the mother hit the father while he hit back less or not at all (see Table 1). These data support our expectation that women,

although they engage in hitting, are oftener the victims of marital violence.

[Table 1 about here]

The same percent (17%) of both men and women reported parental hitting. Nine percent of women vs. 17% of men reported that the father hit the mother while she hit back less or not at all. Three percent of both sexes reported that the mother hit the father while he hit back less or not at all. Five percent of women and 7% of men reported that their parents hit each other equally often. Thus, women respondents were more likely to report PAHIT; men reported PAHIT and BOTHHIT equally often, Both sexes were least likely to report MAHIT (see Table 1).

Reports of parental hitting vary inversely with age. The youngest respondents report proportionately more hitting than do older ones. The relative difference is greatest for BOTHHIT. Young men report proportionately more hitting than do young women (not shown in Table 1).

Reports of parental hitting tend to vary inversely with education. Respondents who completed less than high school are most likely to report parental hitting but respondents who completed one to three years of college were slightly more likely than were high school graduates to report parental hitting. Respondents who completed four years or more of college were least likely to report PAHIT; men in every category are as likely to report BOTHHIT as PAHIT; there is little difference in reports of MAHIT by educational level (not shown in Table 1).

Parental hitting varies inversely with respondent's income, from 22% in the lowest income category to 16% in the highest. By race, parental hitting occurred for 23% of nonwhite vs. 16% of white respondents. Nonwhites are twice as likely as whites to report PAHIT.

Respondents reporting no religion (12%) reported the highest incidence (23%) of parental hitting, and men and women were equally likely to report PAHIT and BOTHHIT. Catholics were more likely than Jews and slightly more likely than Protestants to report hitting. Catholic men were more likely than other men to report PAHIT, but Catholic women were no more likely than Protestant women to report PAHIT (not shown).

Effect of Parental Hitting on Gender Attitudes

In the linear estimation of the effect of parental hitting on gender-related attitudes, parental hitting is a dummy variable with NOHIT as reference category. We first discuss each equation and the probability that parental hitting explains attitudes on WOMROLE and RAPE, then we analyze justifications for wifebeating: NAGGING, HITFIRST, and OTHERMEN, using probit analysis.

WOMROLE. We expected persons who reported parental hitting to express more traditional attitudes than others about women's everyday roles, but parental hitting less effectively predicted WOMROLE attitudes than did the background variables (see Table 2). All parental hitting effects were nonsignificant and, with one exception, the signs were in the direction opposite to what we predicted; except for women who reported MAHIT, respondents reporting parental hitting were less likely than persons reporting NOHIT to hold traditional attitudes.

[Table 2 about here]

Most of the background variables significantly affected respondents' attitudes. As expected, age affected both sexes' attitudes. One year of age increases traditional attitudes by 2% for women and 3% for men, implying a generational effect of 40% to 60%, holding other factors constant.

White men are significantly more likely than nonwhite men to feel that a woman's place is in the home. White women are more likely to hold this view than nonwhite women but the difference is nonsignificant.

Income and education, as expected, related inversely and significantly to traditional views of WOMROLE for both sexes. An increment of $5,000 in family income decreases the likelihood of traditional attitudes for both women and men, as does additional schooling.

Protestant women are significantly much more likely and Catholic women are significantly more likely than women with no religious preference to feel that women belong at home. Protestant men are significantly more likely than men of no religion to hold this traditional view. Catholic men were more likely and Jewish men were less likely to hold traditional views of WOMROLE in comparison to views of men with no religion, but the differences were nonsignificant.

Marital status had significant effects on WOMROLE only for married women, who were more likely than single ones to hold traditional views.

RAPE. PAHIT, age, and income significantly affected women's attitudes toward rape victims. Women reporting PAHIT were less likely than women who reported NOHIT to think that a raped woman was partly to blame. One year of age increases by more than one percentage point the probability of blaming the victim (see Table 3).

[Table 3 about here]

For men, parental hitting is nonsignificant although men who observed PAHIT, unlike their female counterparts, were more likely than men reporting NOHIT to blame the victim. Significant background variables included age: one year of age increases by more than one percentage point the probability of blaming the victim. White men are 22 percentage points less likely than nonwhite men to blame the victim. Education and income also significantly decrease the likelihood of blaming the victim. Religion approaches significance only for Catholic men, who are less likely than men of no religion to blame the victim. Being divorced significantly increases the tendency to blame the victim but other marital statuses have nonsignificant effects.

Wife hitting: NAGGING, HITFIRST, and OTHERMEN. Our expectation that persons who reported parental hitting would be more likely to approve a husband's hitting his wife under certain circumstances received modest support for men but no support for women (see Table 4 for probit coefficients). For NAGGING, the PAHIT coefficient is positive and twice the standard error for men but it is nonsignificant for women and the sign is even negative. MAHIT is significant for women but the sign is positive. In sum, the probability that a person will approve a husband's hitting his wife for nagging is increased for men if they have seen their fathers hitting their mothers but increased for women if they have seen their mothers hitting their fathers.

[Table 4 about here]

PAHIT has a nonsignficant effect on HITFIRST for men while it is signficant for women but the sign is negative; that is, women who observed their father's hitting their mothers are less likely than other women to approve a husband's hitting his wife if she hit first. BOTHHIT is signficant and positive for men's view of HITFIRST, as expected.

For views of OTHERMEN, the sign for PAHIT is positive for men and negative for women but the only signficant variable is BOTHHIT, which is positive, as expected, for men.

Education signficantly affects only OTHERMEN; it affects women's views somewhat more strongly than men's (see Table 4). Effects of age are nonsignficant for both sexes. Race has a significant (negative) effect only for women's attitudes about NAGGING. Income has no signficant effects. Being Protestant or Jewish has no signficant effects but being Catholic reduces both men's and women's tendency to approve of hitting a wife if she hits first and men's tendency to approve hitting a wife for seeing other men. Marital status has no signficant effects.

CONCLUSIONS

Using data collected from a national stratified probability sample of men (N=910) and women (N=1,002) we described the distribution of reported parental hitting and we tested whether attitudes about women's roles and the use of violence against women were affected by having witnessed parental hitting. Following learning theory, we expected that respondents who reported parental hitting would hold more traditional attitudes about women's roles and be more approving of the use of violence against women.

Although 17% of both men and women respondents reported parental hitting, the type of hitting reported varied by sex. More than half of the women who reported it saw the father hit the mother; men were as likely to report having seen both parents hitting equally often as they were to report the father hitting the mother, Both sexes saw the mother hit the father less often than other types of hitting. Reports of parental hitting varied inversely with age. Younger respondents reported more hitting, especially BOTHHIT, than did older ones, and young men reported more hitting than young women did,

Parental hitting unexpectedly failed to significantly affect attitudes about women's roles. It did affect attitudes about blaming women for being raped but the effect varied by sex. Reporting PAHIT negatively affected women's tendency to blame a woman for being raped but the effect was positive for men, as predicted. A lower income level also strongly affected the tendency to think that a rape victim is partly to blame. Being divorced strongly increased men's tendency to blame a woman for being raped.

Parental hitting affected approval of wife hitting but the effects tended to be opposite for men and women. For men, all types of hitting positively affect approval of wife hitting under all three conditions. PAHIT strongly affected men's approval of wife hitting if the wife hit first or was seeing other men. For women, in contrast, PAHIT negatively affected, MAHIT positively affected, and BOTHHIT had mixed effect on approving wife hitting

under the three conditions. PAHIT strong affected women's disapproval of wife hitting if the wife hit first or was seeing other men. But MAHIT increases women's tendency to approve wife hitting for nagging. Of the background variables, education strongly affected men's and women's disapproval of hitting a wife for seeing other men, while being Catholic decreases both sexes' approval of hitting a wife if she hit first and decreases men's approval of hitting a wife for seeing other men.

These findings suggest several important issues. First, why are women most likely to report PAHIT while men are as likely to report BOTHHIT as PAHIT? The most obvious explanation is that a husband may be more reluctant to hit his wife in the presence of a son than of a daughter because the son may intervene to protect the mother, thereby challenging the father's authority. Another possibility is that men's perception is selective; if they define force as a legitimate means to control women's behavior, they may ignore hitting, especially if it does not occur often. In either event, our data may underestimate the incidence of PAHIT.

Second, why are respondent's age and the incidence of parental hitting inversely related? Do respondents forget or repress their memory of parental hitting as they grow older? Or is the incidence of domestic violence increasing? If so, could it be in response to women's demands for equality, as Whitehurst (1974:77) predicted or could it be, rather, a response to the barrage of violence on television?

Third, does observing parental violence affect men and women differently? If so, is the difference integral to gender role socialization? Since aggressiveness is a sex-appropriate behavior for men, they presumably learn

attitudes which favor violence against women as a result of observing the father hitting the mother. Thus, for men, parental violence may strengthen previously learned acceptance of violence as appropriate victims of violence.

The explanation for women's attitudes must be more complex, a possibility we failed to consider adequately when formulating our hypotheses. Too easily we assumed that women who had witnessed violence against women would identify with the aggressor. Perhaps we were influenced by the now popular image of the battered wife as a passive creature unable to leaver her tormentor. Unexpectedly, the question of who hit whom affects women's attitudes about violence against women. Those who witnessed PAHIT tend to disapprove while those who report MAHIT tend to approve violence against women. It is plausible that women reared in father-dominated homes may reject traditional attitudes, especially if the mother expressed unhappiness (Lipman-Blumen, 1971;38). But why do the women reporting MAHIT cling to traditional views? Do they see the mother, despite the hitting, getting the worst of it? Or are these mothers the vigorous battle axes of funny paper legend, playing a Maggie to the father's Jiggs?

Finally, witnessing parental hitting significantly influences attitudes about using violence against women but it does not generalize to attitudes about women's place in everyday life. Sex role attitudes apparently are not organized into a unidimensional ideology. People typically fail to see the connection between the domestic division of labor and women's labor market rights (Mason and Bumpass, 1975:1218); similarly, people fail to relate the use of violence against women to their traditional roles.

Yet, observing parental behavior does affect mens' and women's definition of the appropriateness of using violence against women. While sons may learn that violence is an appropriate menner of relating to women under some circumstances, our findings suggest that daughters may think otherwise. These findings suggest the need to weaken males acceptance of violence against women as appropriate behavior and imply the need for strong negative sanctions such as the legal prosecution of men who engage in rape and wife-beating as the level of social change.

FOOTNOTES

1. Two exceptions are Steinmetz' (1977) study based on a random sample of families in New Castle County, Delaware, and Straus' (1978) study based on a national sample of married and unmarried cohabitors. These findings are not readily comparable to ours because respondents were asked about their own behavior; we ask respondents about parental behavior. In addition, to date these two studies have not reported the relationship between SES variables and spouse violence.

2. This item was used in the 1972 National Election Study.

3. We use listwise deletion which eliminates every case for which data are missing on one or more variables. The relatively small number of persons reporting parental hitting made use reluctant to reduce further the N. Hence we assigned the "don't know" response the mean value in all Kikert-type questions among the dependent variables.

4. We initially tried to form a Guttman-type scale for the conditions under which the respondent approved of wife hitting. The criteria for a Guttman scale, however, are regorous and the coefficient of reproducibility was not within the acceptable limit of scalability. Hence we estimate equations for each condition and compare the unstandardized coefficients across the three variables.

REFERENCES

Baker, Robert and Sandra Ball

1969 Mass Media and Violence: A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence. Washington DC: Government Printing Office.

Bandura, Albert

1973 Aggression. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

1977 Scoial Learning Theory. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, Albert and R.W. Jeffrey

1973 "The role of symbolic coding and rehearsal processes in observational learning. "Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 26;122-130.

Bard, Morton and Joseph Zaeker

1974 "Assaultiveness and alcohol use in family disputes: Police perceptions." Criminology 12 (3):

Bradburn, Norman and Seymour Sudman

1979 Improving Interview Method and Questionnaire Design. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bulcroft, Richard and Murray A. Straus

1975 "Validity of husband, wife, and child reports of conjugal violence and power." Mimeo. University of New Hampshire.

Dobash, Emerson and Russell Dobash

1978 "Wives: The 'appropriate' victims of marital violence." Victimology 2;426-442.

Friedl, Ernestine

1975 Women and Men: An Anthropologist's View. New York: Holt Rinehart Winston.

Gates, Margaret

1978 "Introduction." In Jane Roberts Chapman and Margaret Gates (eds.), The Victimization of Women. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Gayford, J. J.

1975 "Wife battering: A preliminary review of 100 cases." British Medical Journal 1:194-197.

Gelles, Richard J.

1974 The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression between Husbands and Wives. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Goode, William J.

1974 "Force and violence in the Family," In Suzanne Steinmetz and Murray Straus (eds.), Violence in the Family, New York: Harper and Row.

Hilberman, Elaine and Kit Munson

1978 "Sixty battered women." Victimology 2 (3-4):460-470.

Lambert, W. E., Yackley, A., and R. N. Hein

1971 "Child training values of English Canadian and French Canadian parents." Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science 3:217-236.

Lenski, Gerhard and Jean Lenski

1973 Human Societies. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lipman-Blumen, Jean

1972 "How ideology shapes women's lives," Scientific American 226:34-42.

Martin, Del

1976 Battered Wives. San Francisco: Glide Publications.

Owens, David J. and Murray A. Straus

1975 "The social structure of violence in childhood and approval of violence as an adult." Aggressive Behavior 1:193-211.

Pagelow, Mildred Daly

1978a "Social learning theory and sex roles: violence begins in the home,"

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

1978b "Sex roles, power, and woman battering." Paper presented at the Ninth World Congress of Sociology,

Pleck, Elizabeth

1979 "Wife beating in nineteenth century america." Victimology 4 (1):60-74.

Rounsaville, Bruce

1978 "Theories on marital violence: evidence from a study of battered wives." Victimology 3 (1-2):11-31,

Roy, Maria (ed,)

1977 Battered Women. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Steinmetz, Suzanne

1977 "Wife-beating, husband-beating: A comparison of the use of physical violence between spouses to resolve marital fights." In Maria Roy (ed.), Battered Women, New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Straus, Murray A.

1978 "Wife-beating: How common and why," Victimology 2:443-458,

1979 "Stress and assault in a national sample of american families," Revision of a paper presented at the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice,

Sudman, Seymour

1973 "The uses of telephone directories for survey sampling," Journal of Marketing Research 10:204-207.

Waksberg, Joseph

1978 Sampling methods for random digit dialing," Journal of the American Statistical Association 73:400-446.

Whitehurst, Robert

1974 "Violence in husband-wife interaction." In Suzanne Steinmetz and Murray Straus (eds.,), Violence in the Family. New York: Harper and Row.

Wilson, Carolyn and Kathryn Clarenbach

1979 Violence Against Women: Causes and Prevention. University of Wisconsin: Women's Education Resources.

Wolfgang, Marvin

1976 "Family violence and criminal behavior." Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law 4(4):317-327.

TABLE 1. Reported hitting, by social attributes by percent of category

Attribute	FAHIT %	MAHIT %	BOTHHIT %	TOTAL HITTING %	N	TOTAL SAMPLE %	N
Total Sample	8	3	6	17	(342)		(2,002)[a]
Sex							
Men	7	3	7	17	(155)	45	(908)
Women	9	3	5	17	(187)	55	(1,092)
Age							
18 - 27	10	5	11	26	(101)	20	(389)
28 - 37	9	3	7	19	(112)	31	(607)
38 - 47	8	3	6	16	(66)	21	(407)
48 - 57	8	3	2	13	(45)	18	(360)
58 +	3	3	2	8	(18)	11	(222)
Education							
0 - 11	12	4	8	23	(78)	17	(341)
12	8	3	6	17	(150)	43	(868)
13 - 15	8	4	7	19	(73)	19	(386)
16 +	5	2	4	10	(41)	20	(403)
Income							
<$5,000	12	1	9	22	(31)	7	(144)
$5,000 - $9,999	8	3	8	19	(63)	17	(322)
10,000 - 14,999	9	5	5	19	(81)	23	(438)
15,000 - 19,999	7	3	5	15	(62)	20	(397)
20,000 - 24,999	6	2	7	15	(41)	14	(269)
25,000 +	7	2	6	16	(58)	20	(381)
Race							
White	7	3	6	16	(294)	89	(1,788)
Nonwhite	13	2	8	23	(49)	11	(213)
Religion							
Protestant	7	3	6	16	(192)	61	(1,207)
Catholic	9	3	6	18	(80)	22	(434)
Jewish	4	3	4	10	(8)	4	(79)
Other	7	-	4	11	(3)	1	(27)
None	10	4	10	23	(58)	12	(248)

a The total sample size differs slightly for each category because of missing data

TABLE 2. Unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients for attitudes toward women's role, by sex.

	MEN		WOMEN	
	b	B	b	B
PAHIT	-.075	-.011	-.191	-.029
MAHIT	-.307	-.032	-.351	.031
BOTHHIT	-.170	-.024	-.018	-.002
NOHIT[b]				
AGE	.023	.161	.032***	.205
RACE	.016***	.003	.140	.022
EDUCATION	-.121***	-.193	-.152***	-.186
INCOME	-.173***	-.163	-.222***	-.197
PROT	.398*	.108	.757***	.190
CATH	.159	.035	.551	.121
JEW	-.110	-.012	.005	.001
OTHER	-.085	-.005	1.211*	.076
NONE[b]				
MARRIED	.280	.055	.546*	.117
SEPARATED	-.278	-.022	-.337	-.030
DIVORCE	-.028	-.003	-.031	-.004
WIDOWED	1.441	0.62	.131	.016
SINGLE[b]				
CONSTANT	6.636		5.506	
N	819		990	
R^2	.156		.200	
adj R^2	.140		.188	

a * <.05 ** <01 *** <.001
b reference category for dummy variables
c significant at .075 level

TABLE 3. Unstandardized and standardized regression coefficients for attitudes about rape, by sex

	Men		Women	
	b	β	b	β
PAHIT	.165	.042	-.233*	-.068
MAHIT	.047	.008	-.179	-.031
BOTHHIT	-.137	-.034	.031	.007
NOHIT[b]				
AGE	.012***	.140	.014***	.180
RACE	-.221[c]	-.062	.112	.034
EDUCATION	-.074***	-.206	-.045	-.107
INCOME	-.075***	-.122	-.058[c]	-.100
PROT	.017	.008	.176	.086
CATH	-.224[c]	-.086	.047	.020
JEW	-.156	-.029	-.022	-.004
OTHER	-.296	-.033	.019	.002
NONE[b]				
MARRIED	.221	.076	.153	.064
SEPRATED	-.151	-.021	.125	.022
DIVORCE	.596**	.122	-.192	-.049
WIDOWED	.453	.034	-.025	-.006
SINGLE[b]				
CONSTANT	2.931		1.717	
N	819		990	
R^2	.148		.091	
adj R^2	.132		.076	

a *<.05 **<.01 ***<.001

b reference category for dummy variables

c significant at <.075

TABLE 4. Unstandardized probit coefficients for wife beating, by sex

	NAGGING		HITFIRST		OTHERMEN	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
EDUC	-.036	-.056	-.016	-.053	-.059*	-.123***
AGE	.012	-.002	.003	-.009	.001	-.009
RACE	-.193	-.581*	-.246	-.185	-.241	.036
PAHIT	.516*	-.304	.159	-.365*	.121	-.433
MAHIT	.400	.681*	.395	.483	.413	.275
BOTHHIT	.481	-.187	.626**	.113	.414*	.173
NOHIT[b]						
INCOME	-.031	-.002	.010	-.016	-.001	-.072
PROT	-.239	.235	-.224	-.158	-.092	.326
CATH	-.554	.349	-.447*	-.616*	-.761**	.371
JEW	-.168	-5.863	-.196	-.149	.118	-.065
OTHER	-.717	-5.945	.135	.117	.281	1.254
NONE[b]						
MARRIED	.390	-.559	.162	.192	.189	.531
SEPRATED	.594	-7.026	-.546	-.509	-.169	.436
DIVORCE	.132	-.273	.497	.349	.362	.590
WIDOWED	-7.116	-.561	-6.920	.403	-6.660	.741
SINGLE[b]						
CONSTANT	-1.757	-.566	-.579	.590	-.367	-.029
N	780	951	780	951	780	951
χ^2	.50	.10	.01	.001	.01	.001

a * coefficient more than twice the standard deviation,
** coefficient more than three times the standard deviation,
*** coefficient more than four times the standard deviation
b reference category for dummy variable